



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/002,415	08/25/97	ZHANG	MIT 7702

HM42/0810

HAMILTON BROOK SMITH & REYNOLDS
TWO MILITIA DRIVE
LEXINGTON MA 02173-4799

EXAMINER

GARCIA, M

ART UNIT

1010

PAPER NUMBER

12

08/10/99

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/882,415

Applicant(s)
Zhang et al

Examiner
Maurie E. Garcia, Ph. D.

Group Art Unit
1618



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maurie E. Garcia *MEG*

(3) David Brook

(2) Ponnathapura Achutamurthy

(4) Theresa Debron *Debron*

Date of Interview Aug 4, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

Wang et al (Chem. Abstracts Volume 125, Abstract No. 257089b). The text of the full reference was also discussed.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant discussed the 102 rejection from the previous Office Action (Paper No. 11). Applicant mentioned that they had obtained the full text of the Wang et al reference (the rejection by the examiner was made over only the abstract).

Applicant stated that when the whole reference is considered, it provides a clearer picture of what is taught by Wang et al and that Wang et al teaches random/homogeneous organization of peptides as opposed to the instant claims

"predetermined pattern". The definition of "predetermined" was pointed out in the specification, page 12, beginning at line 12. SPE Achutamurthy discussed that the term "predetermined" was very broad and pointed out that the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation, even though they are read in light of the specification. It was suggested that limitations from the specification as to the "predetermined pattern" should be added to the claims.

Applicant will file an amendment in due course, and will provide a copy of the entire Wang et al reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

M. Garcia